2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARQUIS JACKSON, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cr-00164-JNW

ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL

This matter comes before the Court on a joint motion of defendants Marquis Jackson, Mandel Jackson, Edgar Valdez, Keondre Jackson, Michael Young, Sir Terrique Milam, Robert Johnson, Matelita Jackson, Miracle Patu-Jackson, Diyana Abraha, Adean Batinga, Tianna Karastan, Robert Bellair, Ronald Finkbonner, Patrick James, Thomas Morris, Chad Conti, and Phillip Alexander for a continuance of the trial and the pretrial motions due date. The following speedy trial waivers have been submitted to accommodate the request:

- Marquis Jackson—waived through October 31, 2025 (Dkt. No. 236)
- Edgar Valdez—waived through June 30, 2025 (Dkt. No. 223)
- Keondre Jackson—waived through June 4, 2025 (Dkt. No. 251)

7

11

12

10

1314

16

17

15

18 19

20

2122

23

- Michael Young—waived through June 4, 2025 (Dkt. No. 246)
- Sir Terrique Milam—waived through June 20, 2025 (Dkt. No. 224)
- Robert Johnson—waived through December 31, 2025 (Dkt. No. 225)
- Matelita Jackson—waived through June 4, 2025 (Dkt. No. 238)
- Miracle Patu-Jackson—waived through May 31, 2025 (Dkt. No. 240)
- Adean Batinga—waived through May 31, 2025 (Dkt. No. 245)
- Tianna Karastan—waived through May 25, 2025 (Dkt. No. 237)
- Robert Bellair—waived through May 31, 2025 (Dkt. No. 239)
- Robert Finkbonner—waived through May 31, 2025 (Dkt. No. 226)
- Patrick James—waived through June 4, 2025 (Dkt. No. 247)
- Thomas J. Morris—waived through May 5, 2025 (Dkt. No. 233)
- Philip Lamont Alexander—waived through June 5, 2025 (Dkt. No. 248)

Mandel Jackson, Abraha, and Conti join in the motion to continue but have not submitted speedy trial waivers to accommodate their request. The government does not oppose the motion to continue, but two defendants, Markell Jackson and Tyrell Lewis, do.

Upon review of the record, the Court finds that this is a complex case with 20 defendants. The Court further finds:

• taking into account the exercise of due diligence, a failure to grant a continuance would deny counsel for the defendants the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, due to counsels' need for more time to review the evidence, consider possible defenses, and gather evidence material to the defense, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv);

- a failure to grant a continuance would likely result in a miscarriage of justice, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i);
- the additional time requested is a reasonable period of delay, as the
  defendants have requested more time to prepare for trial, to investigate
  the matter, to gather evidence material to the defense, and to consider
  possible defenses;
- the ends of justice will best be served by a continuance, and the ends of justice outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendants in any speedier trial, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A);
- the additional time requested between the current trial date and the new trial date is necessary to provide counsel for the defendants reasonable time to prepare for trial considering counsels' schedules and all of the facts set forth in the motion; and
- any objections to the continuance are hereby overruled. Defendants in this case are alleged to have conspired together, and the charges arise out of a common investigation, including common wiretap applications and common search warrant applications. In a multidefendant cases, a reasonable trial continuance as to any defendant tolls the Speedy Trial Act period as to all joined co-defendants where and no motion for severance has been granted. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(6).

Accordingly, the Court ORDERS:

- 1. The joint motion to continue trial, Dkt. No. 234, is GRANTED.
- 2. The trial date is RESET to May 5, 2025. The Court will issue a separate scheduling order that reflects this continuance and includes additional deadlines and instructions.
- 3. The resulting period of delay from the filing of the motion to continue to the new trial date is hereby excluded for speedy trial purposes under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (h)(7)(B)(iv).

Dated this 26th day of November, 2024.

Jamal N. Whitehead United States District Judge